DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 235 372 CE 037 289

AUTHOR Cheek, Jimmy G.; And Others
TITLE Predicting Whether or Not Agricultural Education Graduates Will Teach. A Report of Research.
INSTITUTION Florida Univ., Gainesville. Inst. of Food and Agricultural Sciences.
PUB DATE Sep 83
NOTE 23p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Achievement; *Agricultural Education; *Career Choice; Demography; Education Majors; Higher Education; Outcomes of Education; *Predictor Variables; Preservice Teacher Education; Questionnaires; *Screening Tests; *Student Teachers; Surveys; *Test Reliability; Test Validity; Values; Vocational Education; Work Attitudes
IDENTIFIERS Purdue Student Teacher Opinionnaire; Tennessee Self Concept Scale; University of Florida; Work Values Inventory

ABSTRACT

A study examined screening measures that are used to predict whether a student will teach after graduation from an agricultural education program. The population for the study consisted of 72 student teachers studying in the Department of Agricultural Education at the University of South Florida from 1977 to 1982. Before starting student teaching, each student completed a background questionnaire, the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale and the Work Value Inventory. Immediately after student teaching, each student took the Purdue Student Teacher Opinionnaire (PSTO). Upon graduation from the agricultural education program, the students were contacted to determine whether they had taken a teaching position. Based on the results of a comparative analysis of all of these data collection measures, the researchers concluded that the PSTO was the only screening instrument that was predictive of whether or not agricultural education students would teach after graduation. Of the 13 predictor variables analyzed, only age seemed to have any significant predictive value. While age and performance on the PSTO were statistically more accurate than the other predictors, they predicted only 53 percent of the cases correctly. This suggests that it may be impractical to predict which agricultural education student will teach based upon demographic, self-concept, work value, and morale measures. (MN)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED235372

PREDICTING WHETHER OR NOT AGRICULTURAL EDUCATION GRADUATES WILL TEACH

A REPORT OF RESEARCH

Jimmy G. Cheek
Max B. McGhee
Gregory West

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

J Cheek

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Department of Agricultural and Extension Education
Institute of Food and Agricultural Sciences
University of Florida
Gainesville, Florida

September, 1983

CE 037289

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The writers wish to express gratitude to the agricultural education students who participated in this study. Gratitude is also extended to the faculty of the Department of Agricultural and Extension Education for their assistance and the Office of the Dean of Research, Institute of Food and Agricultural Sciences, for financial support of this project via departmental research project FLA-AE-0198. Appreciation is also extended to Lynn Kirkland and Barbara Schatt for typing this document.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
Acknowledgements	i
Table of Contents	ii
List of Tables	iii
Introduction	1
Purpose and Objectives	1
Procedure	2
Results	11
Conclusions and Recommendations	13
References	15
Appendix A	17

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		PAGE
1.	GPA and AGE of 72 Agricultural Education Students.....	2
2.	SEX, VOCAG, CLUB, and AREA of 72 Agricultural Education Students.....	3
3.	Tennessee Self-Concept Scale Means, Standard Deviation, and Minimum and Maximum Scores on 72 Agriculture Education Students and Normative Data.....	4
4.	Rotated Factor Loading of SC, TOTC, TOTP, TOTV, and DIST Scores for the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale Administered to 72 Agricultural Education Students.....	5
5.	Tennessee Self-Concept Scale Factor Scores on 72 Agricultural Education Students.....	6
6.	Work Values Inventory Means, Standard Deviation and Minimum and Maximum Scores on 72 Agricultural Education Students.....	7
7.	Rotated Factor Loadings of Fifteen Scales from the Work Values Inventory Administered to 72 Agricultural Education Students.....	8
8.	Work Values Inventory Factors Formed by Factor Analysis of 72 Agricultural Education Students.....	9
9.	Work Values Inventory Dimension Scores on 72 Agricultural Education Students.....	9
10.	Purdue Student-Teacher Opinionnaire Scale Scores on 72 Agricultural Education Students and on Normative Sample.....	11
11.	Results of Discriminant Analysis Between Teaching Group and Non-Teaching Group of 72 Agricultural Education Students.....	12
12.	Results of Predicting Group Membership Based Upon the Predictors AGE and PS-TO.....	12

PREDICTING WHETHER OR NOT AGRICULTURAL EDUCATION GRADUATES WILL TEACH

INTRODUCTION

The shortage of teachers in the field of agricultural education has been well documented (Craig, 1980). This teacher shortage has been aggravated by the fact that a low percentage of certified graduates from agricultural education programs take teaching positions (Craig, 1982; Moss and Briers, 1982). At the University of Florida, only 58 percent of the 1977-1982 agricultural education graduates took teaching positions in the first year after graduation.

Educators have suggested a number of ways to ease the shortage of agricultural teachers. One suggestion has been to provide career guidance which will effectively influence students to enter agricultural education programs (Hillison and Hagee, 1980). A second approach has been to develop measures of teacher morale and teacher satisfaction which will be predictive of agricultural teacher longevity (Kittrell, 1978; Miller, 1977, 1978; Briers and Byler, 1979; White, 1979; Collins and Key, 1982). A third approach to the teacher shortage problem has been to increase the percentage of certified graduates from agricultural education programs who take teaching positions. This third approach requires the identification of screening measures which are predictive of whether a student will teach after graduating from an agricultural education program.

PURPOSE AND OBJECTIVES

The central purpose of this study was to identify screening measures which were predictive of whether a student would teach after graduating from an agricultural education program. In order to be effective screening measures, the data must be collectible before admission into the agricultural education program. Although the Purdue Student-Teacher Opinionnaire (PS-TO) in this study was collected immediately after the student teaching term, the PS-TO was included in the study since a motivation/morale measure could be collected prior to entering teaching and since morale has been shown to be a predictor of agricultural education students "plan to teach" (Moss and Briers, 1982).

This research was designed to answer two specific questions:

1. What measures available prior to enrollment and during enrollment in an agricultural education program are statistically significant predictors of whether a student teaches after graduating from the program?

2. Do the statistically significant predictors screen the applicants with sufficient reliability to provide a practical means of selecting students who are likely to enter teaching?

PROCEDURE

This study included the 72 student teachers in the Department of Agricultural and Extension Education at the University of Florida from 1977 to 1982. Before student teaching, each student completed a background data questionnaire (Appendix A), took the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale, and took the Work Values Inventory. Immediately after student teaching, each student took the Purdue Student-Teacher Opinionnaire. Upon graduation from the agricultural education program, each student was contacted to determine whether the student had taken a teaching position during the year following graduation. The data for this study therefore included the demographic characteristics questionnaire, the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale, the Work Values Inventory, the Purdue Student-Teacher Opinionnaire, and the student's post-graduation report to the department as to whether or not (s)he had taken a teaching position.

Demographic Characteristics Questionnaire

The demographic characteristics questionnaire elicited six responses from each student: two continuous variables and four dichotomously scored variables. The two continuous measures were GPA for junior and senior undergraduate work and AGE. The GPA was confirmed by university transcripts. Table 1 reports the means, standard deviations, and ranges for GPA and AGE on the 72 students in this study.

TABLE 1

GPA and AGE of 72 Agricultural Education Students

VARIABLE	$\bar{x}$	SD	MIN	MAX
GPA	2.91	0.53	1.88	3.97
AGE	25.00	5.35	20.00	50.00

The four dichotomously-scored variables were (1) whether the student was male or female (SEX), (2) whether the student had ever enrolled in vocational agriculture in high school (VOCAG), (3) whether the student had belonged to FFA or 4-H for at least one year (CLUB), and (4) whether the student had been raised primarily in a rural or urban area (AREA). For the purposes of this study, male sex, one or more years of enrollment in vocational agriculture in high school, one or more years of club membership, and rural background were scored as ones. The opposite values, female sex, no enrollment in vocational agriculture, no club membership, and urban background were scored as zeros. Table 2 presents the percentages for the dichotomously-scored background variables.

TABLE 2

SEX, VOCAG, CLUB, and AREA of 72
Agricultural Education Students

VARIABLE	PERCENT	PERCENT
SEX	41.67 Female	58.33 Male
VOCAG	44.44 Non Voc. Ag. H.S.	55.56 Voc. Ag. H.S.
CLUB	38.34 Non-Member	61.66 Member
AREA	37.50 Urban	62.50 Rural

From Tables 1 and 2, it can be seen that the average student in this study was 25 years old. Two-thirds of the students had been in FFA or 4-H and had been raised in a rural area. Somewhat more than half had enrolled in vocational agriculture in high schools. There was a fairly even mix of males and females.

Tennessee Self-Concept Scale

The Tennessee Self-Concept Scale is a 100 item multi-dimensional scale which yielded five scores of interest for each of the 72 students: (1) Self-Criticism score (SC), (2) Total Conflict score (TOTC), (3) Total P score (TOTP), (4) Total V score (TOTV), and (5) Distribution score (DIST). The Tennessee Self-Concept Scale Manual (Fitts, 1965) gives the following definitions for the five scores of interest:

1. Self-Criticism Score. This scale is composed of 10 items. These are all mildly derogatory statements that most people admit as being true for them. Individuals who deny most of these statements most often are being defensive and making a deliberate effort to present a favorable picture of themsleves. High scores generally indicate a normal, healthy openness, and capacity for self-criticism (Fitts, 1965, p.2).

2. Total Conflict Score. High scores indicate confusion, contradiction, and general conflict in self-perception. Low scores have the opposite interpretation. The conflict scores are reflections of conflicting responses to positive and negative items within the same area of perception (Fitts, 1965, p.4).

3. Total P Score. It reflects the overall level of self-esteem. Persons with high scores tend to like themselves, feel that they are persons of value and worth, have confidence in themselves, and act accordingly. People with low scores are doubtful about their own worth, see themselves as undesirable, often feel anxious, depressed, and unhappy, and have little faith or confidence in themselves (Fitts, 1965, p.2).

4. Total V Score. This represents the total amount of variability for the entire record. High scores mean that the person's self concept is so variable from one area to another as to reflect little unity or integration. High scoring persons tend to compartmentalize certain areas of self and view those areas quite apart from the remainder of self. Well integrated people generally score below the mean on these scores but above the first percentile (Fitts, 1965, p.3).

5. Distribution Score. This score is a summary score of the way one distributes his answers across the five available choices in responding to the items on the scale. It is also interpreted as a measure of skill, another aspect of self-perception, certainly about the way one sees himself. High scores indicate that the subject is very definite and certain in what he says about himself while low scores mean just the opposite (Fitts, 1965, p.3).

The data gathered from the 72 students in this study and the normative data collected by Fitts (1965) are reported in Table 3. To determine whether the students in this study had score means higher or lower than the score means from the standardizing population reported by Fitts (1965, pp. 13-14), the means of the study group and the standardized group on the five Tennessee Self-Concept Scale scores reported in Table 3 were compared at the 0.05 alpha level (controlling for error for the family of five comparisons). Four of the means were significantly different: SC, TOTC, TOTP, and TOTV. The students in the study, therefore, tended to have lower self-criticism scores, higher total conflict scores, lower total P scores (self-esteem), and lower total V scores (variability) than the subjects in Fitt's norming population.

TABLE 3

Tennessee Self-Concept Scale Scores
on 72 Agricultural Education
Students and Normative Data**

SCORE	$\bar{x}$	NORM $\bar{x}$	STUDY SD	NORM SD	MIN	MAX
SC	30.49	35.54*	4.52	6.70	22.00	44.00
TOTC	33.36	30.10*	10.36	8.21	18.00	66.00
TOTP	314.64	345.57*	38.29	30.70	254.00	419.00
TOTV	37.79	48.53*	9.21	12.42	21.00	70.00
DIST	122.64	120.44	20.12	24.19	85.00	174.00

* Study $\bar{x}$ not equal to Norm $\bar{x}$ at the .05 level of significance.

** The normative data reported by Fitts (1965, pp.13-14)is based on a sample of 626 people. Fitts does not describe in adequate detail the sampling procedure or the sample.

Since Fitts (1965) reports no factor-analytic study of the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale scores, the five scores of interest in this study were submitted to a principal component factor analysis with oblique rotation. Oblique rotation was chosen over orthogonal rotation since a clearer factor picture resulted. The two factors with latent roots greater than 1.0 were rotated. Table 4 reports the rotated factor pattern, with factor 1 composed primarily of SC, TOTC, and TOTV and with factor 2 composed primarily of TOTP.

TABLE 4

Rotated Factor Loadings of SC, TOTC, TOTP, TOTV, and DIST Scores from the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale Administered to 72 Agricultural Education Students

VARIABLE	FACTOR 1	FACTOR 2
SC	0.70	0.40
TOTC	0.72	-0.49
TOTP	0.00	0.93
TOTV	0.82	0.12
DIST	0.08	0.53

Since the factor loadings from Table 4 of SC, TOTC, and TOTV on Factor 1 were greater than 0.60, the three scores SC, TOTC, and TOTV were associated with Factor 1. Likewise, since the factor loading of TOTP on Factor 2 was greater than 0.60, the score TOTP was associated with Factor 2. DIST did not load on either Factor 1 or Factor 2.

High scores on Factor 1; therefore, tend to indicate self-criticism, confusion, and variability. Factor 1 is hereafter referred to as UNCERTAINTY. High scores on Factor 2, however, tend to indicate high self-esteem; therefore Factor 2 is hereafter referred to as SELF-ESTEEM. The factor scores UNCERTAINTY and SELF-ESTEEM were the measures from the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale which were used as predictors of whether a student entered teaching after graduation. Table 5 reports the means, standard deviations, and ranges for the factor scores UNCERTAINTY and SELF-ESTEEM. The means and standard deviations for the two factors on Table 5 are zero and 1 respectively because the factor scores were generated as Z-scores (SAS, 1982).

TABLE 5

Tennessee Self-Concept Scale Factor Scores
on 72 Agricultural Education Students**

VARIABLE	$\bar{x}$	SD	MIN	MAX
UNCERTAINTY	0.00	1.00	-1.69	2.58
SELF-ESTEEM	0.00	1.00	-1.91	2.38

** Factor scores were generated with the SAS (1982) SCORE output option in the factor procedure.

Work Values Inventory

The Work Values Inventory is a 45 item scale developed to assess the goals which motivate people to work (Super, 1970). The scale is designed to measure both values extrinsic to as well as those intrinsic to work, that is, the satisfactions people see in work as well as the satisfactions which are the concomitants or outcomes of work. The inventory yields fifteen scales composed of three items for each scale. Table 6 reports the scores on the fifteen scales for the 72 Agricultural Education students in this study and for the normative sample reported in Super (1970). As the asterisks in Table 6 indicate, four of the means for the students in this study and the subjects in the normative sample were significantly different at the 0.05 alpha level (controlling for error for the family of fifteen comparisons). The agricultural education students in this study had significantly higher scores than the subjects in the normative sample on supervisory relations, independence, variety, and altruism. On the other eleven scores, the agricultural education students in this study were not significantly different from the subjects in the normative sample.

TABLE 6

Work Values Inventory Means, Standard Deviation, and Minimum and Maximum Score on 72 Agricultural Education Students and Normative Data**

	SCALES	STUDY $\bar{X}$	NORM $\bar{X}$	STUDY SD	NORM SD	MIN	MAX
1.	Creativity	11.68	11.09	2.01	2.44	6.00	15.00
2.	Management	10.13	9.51	1.94	2.30	5.00	14.00
3.	Achievement	13.40	12.75	1.92	2.07	4.00	15.00
4.	Surroundings	12.35	12.03	2.30	2.14	6.00	15.00
5.	Supervisory Relations	13.51	12.58*	1.85	2.11	6.00	15.00
6.	Way of Life	13.82	13.40	1.90	2.01	5.00	15.00
7.	Security	11.93	12.60	2.69	2.53	3.00	15.00
8.	Associates	10.96	10.92	1.95	2.12	5.00	15.00
9.	Esthetics	9.51	8.70	2.30	2.82	4.00	15.00
10.	Prestige	11.71	11.27	2.30	2.29	5.00	15.00
11.	Independence	12.08	11.35*	1.98	2.20	6.00	15.00
12.	Variety	11.68	10.87*	2.06	2.39	6.00	15.00
13.	Economic Return	12.43	12.59	2.34	2.24	6.00	15.00
14.	Altruism	13.14	12.16*	2.12	2.40	5.00	15.00
15.	Intellect Stimulation	11.54	11.64	2.01	2.10	5.00	15.00

* Sample $\bar{X}$ unequal to Norm $\bar{X}$ at the .05 level of significance.

** Normative data from 1,396 students in 12th grade (Super, 1970).

In a factor analytic study of 51 boys and 48 girls in 10th grade, Super (1970) found that the fifteen scales could be reduced to four dimensions: (1) material, (2) goodness of life, (3) self-expression, and (4) behavior control. In order to determine whether the fifteen scales in the current study could be reduced to four similar dimensions, the fifteen scales for each of the 72 agricultural education students in this study were submitted to a principal component analysis with varimax rotation. Varimax rotation was used since it was used in Super's analysis (1970). On the basis of the screen test (Cattel, 1966) and of the fact that only four factors had latent roots greater than 1.0, four factors were rotated. The rotated factor loadings are reported in Table 7.

TABLE 7

Rotated Factor Loadings of Fifteen Scales from the Work Values Inventory Administered to 72 Agricultural Education Students**

SCALES	FACTOR 1	FACTOR 2	FACTOR 3	FACTOR 4
1. Creativity	----	0.77	----	----
2. Management	----	----	0.67	----
3. Achievement	0.82	----	----	----
4. Surroundings	----	----	----	0.52
5. Supervisory Relations	0.71	----	----	----
6. Way of Life	0.73	----	----	----
7. Security	----	----	----	0.58
8. Associates	----	----	0.77	----
9. Esthetics	----	0.70	----	----
10. Prestige	----	----	0.69	----
11. Independence	----	----	----	0.60
12. Variety	----	0.69	----	----
13. Economic Return	----	----	----	0.80
14. Altruism	0.77	----	----	----
15. Intellect Stimulation	----	0.71	----	----

** Factor loadings less than 0.50 have been deleted for clarity.

Scales were considered to be a component of the dimension if the rotated factor loading from Table 6 loaded on the factor greater than 0.60. The four dimensions formed by allocating only scales with factor loadings greater than 0.60 are remarkably similar to the four dimensions produced by the factor analysis of the 10th grade students in Super's study. Table 8 reports the composition of the four dimensions in the present study.

TABLE 8

Work Values Inventory Factors
Formed by Factor Analysis of
72 Agricultural Education
Students

DIMENSION	COMPONENT SCALES
Material	Surroundings, Security, Independence*, Economic Return
Goodness of Life	Achievement, Supervisory Relations*, Way of Life, Altruism
Self-Expression	Creativity, Esthetics, Variety, Intellectual Stimulation*
Behavior Control	Management, Associates*, Prestige

* Super (1970, p.32) reported Independence associated with self-expression, Supervisory Relations associated with Material, Intellectual Stimulation associated with Behavior Control, and Associates associated with Goodness of Life.

For the purposes of this study, therefore, each of the 72 agricultural education students was assigned four Work Values Inventory scores, produced by summing the scale scores associated with the four dimensions reported in Table 8. The means, standard deviations, and ranges for the four dimensions of the Work Values Inventory administered to 72 agricultural education students are presented in Table 9.

TABLE 9

Work Values Inventory Dimension Scores on
72 Agricultural Education Students

DIMENSION	$\bar{x}$	SD	MIN	MAX
Material	48.79	7.27	24.00	59.00
Goodness of Life	53.88	6.78	21.00	60.00
Self-Expression	44.43	6.74	23.00	60.00
Behavior Control	32.79	5.10	19.00	43.00

Purdue Student-Teacher Opinionnaire

The Purdue Student-Teacher Opinionnaire (PS-TO) was administered to each of the 72 agricultural education students in this study immediately after the student's student-teaching term. The PS-TO is a 60 item measure of student-teacher morale, intended to provide educators with objective indices of student-teacher morale. The items in the PS-TO force the student to make qualitative judgments about his or her environment that are believed to be related to morale. The judgments are then quantified into nine scales (Bentley and Price, 1972).

The PS-TO has been widely used in agricultural education research (Briers and Byler, 1979; Byler and Byler, 1981; Moss and Briers, 1982). Although the PS-TO in the present study would not be useful to pre-select agricultural education students into the program because the PS-TO is not normally administered until during or after the student-teaching term, the PS-TO was collected and entered into the analysis since a PS-TO type of measure of morale could in fact be administered prior to entrance into teaching as a screening measure. The medians for the nine scales of the PS-TO on both the students in this study and on the normative sample collected by Bentley and Price (1972) are presented in Table 10.

Table 10 indicates that the students in the study were above the 50 percent norm group in Rapport with Principal, Rapport with University Supervisor, School Facilities and Services, Professional Preparation, and Rapport with other Teachers. Moss and Briers (1982) reported that six of the nine factors were significantly correlated with "plans to teach": Rapport with Supervising Teacher, Rapport with University Supervisor, Teaching as a Profession, School Facilities and Services, Professional Preparation, and Rapport with Students. An exploratory discriminant analysis of the 72 students in the present study indicated that only Teaching as a Profession ($F(1,70)=6.80$, $p<0.01$) was a significant predictor of whether an agricultural education graduate actually took a teaching position after graduation.

TABLE 10

Purdue Student-Teacher Opinionnaire Scale Scores
on 72 Agricultural Education Students
and on Normative Sample**

SCALE	SAMPLE MEDIAN	NORM 25 PERCENT	NORM 50 PERCENT	NORM 75 PERCENT
1. Rapport with Supervising Teacher	3.49	2.77	3.58	3.99
2. Rapport with Principal	3.45	1.73	2.81	3.49
3. Rapport with University Supervisor	3.61	2.39	3.33	3.90
4. Teaching as a Profession	3.14	2.73	3.30	3.83
5. School Facilities and Services	3.54	2.51	3.38	3.92
6. Professional Preparation	3.39	1.78	2.70	3.30
7. Rapport with Students	3.43	3.07	3.63	3.96
8. Rapport with other Teachers	3.53	2.78	3.46	3.92
9. Student Teacher Load	3.38	2.89	3.68	4.00

** The PS-TO was normed on 4,432 student teachers (Bentley and Price, 1970).

RESULTS

In order to distinguish between agricultural education students who were likely to enter teaching in the year after completing the agricultural education program and students who were likely to enter a field other than teaching, a step-wise discriminant analysis was performed. The predicted variable in this analysis was whether or not the student took a teaching position in the year following the completion of the agricultural education program. The predictor variables were the thirteen demographic, academic and test variables for each of the 72 agricultural education students.

As Table 11 reports, the step-wise discriminant analysis indicated that AGE($F(1,70)=5.524$, $p<0.022$) was a statistically significant predictor of the two groups of students. On the second step of the step-wise discriminant analysis, PS-TO was also found to be a significant predictor ($F(1,69)=6.396$, $p<0.014$).

TABLE 11

Results of Discriminant Analysis Between Teaching Group and Non-Teaching Group of 72 Agricultural Education Students

PREDICTOR VARIABLE	TEACH $\bar{X}$	TEACH SD	NOT-TEACH $\bar{X}$	NOT-TEACH SD	F	P>F
1. GPA	2.91	0.51	2.90	0.58	0.011	0.915
2. AGE	26.21	6.42	23.30	2.58	5.524	0.022
3. SEX	0.41	0.50	0.43	0.50	0.057	0.812
4. VOCAG	0.47	0.50	0.40	0.50	0.402	0.528
5. CLUB	0.60	0.50	0.63	0.50	0.104	0.748
6. AREA	0.36	0.50	0.40	0.50	0.134	0.716
7. UNCERTAINTY	0.07	1.05	-0.11	0.94	0.595	0.443
8. SELF-CRITICISM	-0.09	0.92	0.13	1.11	0.888	0.349
9. MATERIAL	48.91	7.19	48.63	7.50	0.024	0.877
10. GOODNESS OF LIFE	54.56	6.39	53.20	7.34	0.506	0.479
11. SELF-EXPRESSION	45.31	7.00	43.20	6.67	1.731	0.193
12. BEHAVIOR CONTROL	33.12	5.26	32.33	4.92	0.412	0.523
13. PS-TO	30.36	2.80	28.96	3.14	3.966	0.050

The means and standard deviations for the teach and non-teach groups reported in Table 11 indicates that agricultural education students who entered teaching tended to be older (26.21 years) than those students who took other jobs (23.30). The teach group also tended to have higher morale (PS-TO) scores (30.36) than those who did not teach (28.96). The AGE and PS-TO variables were, however, weak predictors of whether or not a student taught, with AGE accounting for only 7.3 percent of the variance in the TEACH variable and PSTO accounts for only 8.5 percent of the variance in TEACH. Consequently, the overall accuracy of the prediction from the standardized discriminant equation when applied to the classification of cases into the two groups was only 53 percent with only 38 of the 72 students correctly classified. The prediction results are reported in Table 12.

TABLE 12

Results of Predicting Group Membership Based Upon the Predictors AGE and PS-TO

ACTUAL GROUP	PREDICTED GROUP NOT-TEACH	TEACH	TOTAL
NOT-TEACH	25 (83%)	5 (17%)	30 (47%)
TEACH	29 (75%)	13 (25%)	42 (53%)

As Table 12 indicates, the standardized discriminant equation has misclassified 29 of the 42 teachers in the study and misclassified five of the thirty non-teachers in the study. Although the standardized discriminant equation predicted relatively well those in the actual non-teaching group (83 percent), the equation misclassified most of the actual teachers in this study (75 percent).

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This study indicates that of the six demographic and academic variables, of the two measures from the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale, of the four measures from the Work Value Inventory, and of the total score from the Purdue Student-Teacher Opinionnaire, only AGE and PSTO were predictive of whether or not an agricultural education student would enter teaching after graduation. In addition, both AGE and PS-TO were found to be weak predictors, together predicting only 53 percent of the cases correctly. While AGE and PS-TO were statistically more predictive than no predictor, AGE and PS-TO were not effective screening measures of whether a student would enter teaching, since they accounted for such a small amount of the variation in the variable TEACH.

This study therefore suggests that it may be impractical on the basis of demographic, self-concept, work values, and morale measures to pre-screen Agricultural Education students into those likely to teach and those not likely to teach. The current study is, of course, not conclusive, since there may well be variables which might be effective predictors of a student's eventual teaching. It may, however, be that the variables which are most predictive are economic and sociological measures. Although it might be possible by identifying other effective predictor variables to reduce the percentage of students who enter agricultural education programs and who then do not teach, this study suggests that the more fruitful approaches to the agricultural teacher shortage problem might be in the areas of pre-university guidance or teacher morale and satisfaction.

REFERENCES

Bentley, R.R. and Price, J. Manual for the Purdue Student-Teacher Opinionnaire. Indiana: Purdue Research Foundation, 1972.

Briers, G.E. and Byler, B.L. Morale of Student Teachers in Agricultural Education at Iowa State University. The Journal of the American Association of Teacher Educators in Agriculture, 1979, 20 (3), 41-51.

Byler, B.L. and Byler, L.F. Analysis of Student Teacher Morale Before and After Student Teaching. Mississippi State, Mississippi: Mississippi State University, 1981.

Cattell, R.B. The Screen Test for the Number of Factors. Multivariate Behavioral Research, 1966, 1, 245.

Collins, J.R. and Key, J.P. Identification of Selected Factors Which Influence Job Satisfaction of Vocational Agriculture Teachers in Area VIII of Texas. Stillwater, Oklahoma: Oklahoma State University, 1982.

Craig, D.G. A Study of Fifteen-Year Trends of the Supply and Demand of Vo-Ag Teachers in the United States. Agriculture Teachers Directory, 1980, 70, 74-75.

A National Study of the Supply and Demand for Teachers of Vocational Agriculture in 1982. Knoxville, Tennessee: The University of Tennessee, 1982.

Fitts, W.H. Tennessee Self-Concept Scale Manual. Nashville, Tennessee: Counselor Recordings and Tests, 1965.

Hillison, J. and Hagee, G.A. Study to Determine Influencing Factors for Selecting Agricultural Education as a Career with Implications for Recruitment. Paper presented at National Agricultural Education Research Meeting. New Orleans, Louisiana, December 5, 1980.

Kittrell, D. Relationships Between Selected Teacher and Job Setting Variables and Morale of Vocational Agricultural Teachers in Mississippi. The Journal of the American Association of Teacher Educators in Agriculture, 1978, 19 (2), 17-21.

Miller, L.E. Relationship Between First Year Teachers' Morale and Behavior. The Journal of the American Association of Teacher Educators in Agriculture, 1977, 18 (3), 11-18.

Correlation of Selected Variables with the Morale of Virginia Teachers of Agricultural Education. The Journal of the American Association of Teacher Educators in Agriculture, 1978, 19 (1), 29-38.

Moss, J.W. and Briers, G. E. Relationship of Attitudes of Vocational Student Teachers to Their Plans to Teach. Paper presented at Research Section Meeting of the American Vocational Education Research Association. St. Louis, Missouri, December 6, 1982.

SAS User's Guide: Statistics. Cary, North Carolina: SAS Institute, 1982.

Super, D.E. Work Values Inventory Manual. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1970.

White, J.D. Identification and Comparison of Factors Influencing Oklahoma Vocational Agriculture Instructors to Remain in the Profession. Stillwater, Oklahoma: Oklahoma State University, 1979.

APPENDIX A

Demographic Characteristics of Student
Teachers in Agricultural Education at
The University of Florida

Directions: Please respond to the following questions by completing the information requested or by checking the appropriate response.

1. Name_____

2. Current Address_____

_____

3. Current Phone Number_____

4. Permanent Address_____

_____

5. Permanent Phone Number_____

6. Age_____

7. What is your sex? Male_____ Female_____

8. Were you ever enrolled in vocational agriculture in high school?

Yes_____ No_____

9. Were you ever a member of 4-H?

Yes_____ No_____

If yes, indicate the number of years:_____years.

10. Were you ever a member of FFA?

Yes_____ No_____

If yes, indicate the number of years:_____years.

11. Indicate where you were primarily reared?

Farm or Ranch _____ Suburban (non-farm)_____
Rural (non-farm) _____ Other (specify) _____
Urban _____

12. Indicate your status in college:

Undergraduate_____ Graduate_____

13. What do you plan to do upon graduation?

_____ Teach vocational agriculture
_____ Seek employment as an extension agent
_____ Attend graduate school
_____ Other (specify)_____
_____

14. List the clubs, organizations, fraternities, etc. that you are a member of:

_____ _____
_____ _____
_____ _____
_____ _____
_____ _____

15. List the college and university honors that you have received:

_____ _____
_____ _____
_____ _____
_____ _____
_____ _____

16. List the offices you have held since entering college.

_____ _____
_____ _____
_____ _____
_____ _____
_____ _____

Do Not Complete

17. SAT Score_____

18. ACT Score_____

19. GPA First two years of college_____

20. GPA Second two years of college_____